

Remarks

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Written Office Action. Applicant further thanks the Examiner for the additional reference cited.

With regards the substantive portion of the Written Office Action, claims 1-6 and 8-20 were rejected and claim 7 was objected to. Specifically, claims 1-2, 5, 8-11, 14-15, 18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Black '405. Further, claims 3-4, 13 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Black '405 in view of Black '777. Further still, claims 6, 12, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Black '405 in view of US Patent # 4,177,961 to Gruenwald. Finally, the Office Action objected to claim 7 as being dependant upon a rejected base claim, noting it would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1-5, 11, 13 and 14 are currently amended. Claims 6-10, 12 and 15-20 are original.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the additional limitation "a pair of nubs on opposite walls of the slot." Black '777 teaches the use of two nubs placed only on one wall. A pair of nubs on opposite walls of the slot provide for symmetrical obstructing resulting in less slippage. Consequently, and for other reasons not listed herein, it is respectfully requested that Claim 1 be allowed.

Claim 2 has been amended to include all the limitations of Claim 1 in addition to the limitation of "further comprising at least two successive pairs of nubs wherein both pairs of nubs are configured to grip a single cord." Successive pairs of nubs configured to grip a single cord further decrease the freedom of motion of the gripped cord which makes the cord less prone to slippage. Consequently, for these reasons, the reasons listed in the above paragraph and other reasons not listed herein, it is respectfully requested that Claim 2 be allowed.

Claim 3 has been amended to include all the limitations of claim 2 in addition to the additional limitation of "wherein the successive pairs of nubs progressively decrease in size according to the distance from an open end of the tapered slot." When the successive pairs of nubs progressively decrease in size inside a tapered slot, a range of grip sizes is created, thereby allowing the cord to be placed within the grip of a set of four nubs configured to provide the grip size most suitable for the particular cord. This is especially useful in the current invention where it is contemplated to use the invention to wind two different cords, such as Christmas lights on one winding and the accompanying extension cord on the other winding side. This is a particularly valuable feature of the present invention, wherein having adaptable slots allows both cords to be wound to the same device and stored together since would typically be wound and unwound for the same purpose at the same time. Without this configuration of successive pairs of nubs one cord or the other would not be securely wound about the device for failure of the device to accommodate one size of cord, while accommodating

the other. Consequently, for these reasons, the reasons listed in the above paragraph and other reasons not listed herein, it is respectfully requested that Claim 3 be allowed.

Claim 4 has been amended to include all the limitations of Claim 3 in addition to the additional limitation of “wherein the tapered slot tapers to a point.” Black ‘405, Black ‘777, and Gruenwald all teach only minimal tapering. Tapering to a point allows the slot to accommodate a much wider range of cord sizes. For the reasons listed in the above paragraph and for other reasons not listed herein, it is respectfully requested that Claim 4 be allowed.

Claim 5 has been amended to include all the limitations of Claim 2 in addition to the additional limitation of “wherein a first winding region inner length is substantially equal to a second winding region inner length.” Black ‘405 and Black ‘777 both teach having different winding sizes. This may cause difficulty where two identically designed cords are wrapped around the device, but one is longer than the other. In such a case, it may be difficult to determine which is the longer of the two without unwinding both. Having identical lengths of winding areas allows such a problem to be solved by glancing at the cords to see which winding appears larger. For the reasons listed in the above paragraphs and for other reasons not listed herein, it is respectfully requested that Claim 5 be allowed.

Claims 6 – 10 are original. For the reasons listed in the above paragraphs and for other reasons not listed herein it is respectfully requested that Claims 6 – 10 be allowed.

Claim 11 has been amended, changing each instance of the phrase "winding region length" with "winding region inner length." While the Examiner has pointed out that the first and second winding regions of Black '405 have the same length, side to side as seen in figure 4, the first and second winding regions of Black '405 do not have the same winding region inner length. Consequently, for these reasons, the reasons listed in the above paragraph and other reasons not listed herein, it is respectfully requested that Claim 11 be allowed.

Claim 12 is original. For the reasons listed in the above paragraphs and for other reasons not listed herein it is respectfully requested that Claim 12 be allowed.

Claim 13 has been amended to include all the limitations of Claim 12 in addition to the additional limitation "further comprising at least two successive pairs of nubs wherein each member of each pair are on opposite walls of the tapered slot and wherein both pairs of nubs are configured to grip a single cord and wherein successive pairs of nubs progressively decrease in size according to the distance from an open end of the slot." When the successive pairs of nubs progressively decrease in size inside a tapered slot, a range of grip sizes is created for, thereby allowing the cord to be placed within the grip of a set of four nubs configured to provide the grip size most suitable for the particular cord. This is especially useful in the current invention where it is contemplated to use the invention to wind two different cords, such as Christmas lights on one winding and the accompanying extension cord on the other winding. This is a particularly valuable feature of the present invention, wherein having adaptable slots allows both cords to be wound to the same device and stored together since

would typically be wound and unwound for the same purpose at the same time.

Without this configuration of successive pairs of nubs one cord or the other would not be securely wound about the device for failure of the device to accommodate one size of cord, while accommodating the other. Consequently, for these reasons, the reasons listed in the above paragraph and other reasons not listed herein, it is respectfully requested that Claim 11 be allowed.

Claim 21 is a new claim. The device in Claim 21 has bi-axial symmetry from left to right and top to bottom. The art of record does not illustrate this bi-axial type symmetry as claimed. Consequently, and for other reasons not listed herein, it is respectfully requested that Claim 21 be allowed.

Claim 22 is a new claim including all of the limitations of Claim 21 as well as the limitation "wherein the elongated handle, tapered slot and winding region are each oriented substantially parallel." The art of record does not illustrate this substantially parallel orientation as claimed. Consequently, for the reasons listed above and for other reasons not listed herein, it is respectfully requested that Claim 24 be allowed.

Claim 23 is a new claim including all of the limitations of Claim 22 as well as the limitation "wherein a winding region outer wall is substantially planar with the outer wall of the tapered slot." The art of record does not illustrate this planar orientation as claimed. Consequently, for the reasons listed above and for other reasons not listed herein, it is respectfully requested that Claim 24 be allowed.

Claim 24 is a new claim including all of the limitations of Claim 23 as well as the limitation "wherein the tapered slot further comprises a pair of nubs attached to the

inner wall and outer wall, configured to act in concert as a cord grip.” Black ‘777

teaches the use of two nubs placed only on one wall. A pair of nubs on opposite walls of the slot provide for symmetrical obstructing resulting in less slippage. Consequently, and for other reasons not listed herein, it is respectfully requested that Claim 24 be allowed.

Claim 25 is a new claim including all of the limitations of Claim 24 as well as the limitation “at least two successive pairs of nubs wherein both pairs of nubs are configured to grip, in concert, a single cord.” Successive pairs of nubs configured to grip a single cord further decrease the freedom of motion of the gripped cord which makes the cord less prone to slippage. Consequently, for these reasons, the reasons listed in the above paragraph and other reasons not listed herein, it is respectfully requested that Claim 25 be allowed.

Claim 26 is a new claim including all of the limitations of Claim 25 as well as the limitation “wherein the successive pairs of nubs progressively decrease in size according to the distance from an open end of the tapered slot.” When the successive pairs of nubs progressively decrease in size inside a tapered slot, a range of grip sizes is created for, thereby allowing the cord to be placed within the grip of a set of four nubs configured to provide the grip size most suitable for the particular cord. This is especially useful in the current invention where it is contemplated to use the invention to wind two different cords, such as Christmas lights on one winding and the accompanying extension cord on the other winding. This is a particularly valuable feature of the present invention, wherein having adaptable slots allows both cords to be

wound to the same device and stored together since would typically be wound and unwound for the same purpose at the same time. Without this configuration of successive pairs of nubs one cord or the other would not be securely wound about the device for failure of the device to accommodate one size of cord, while accommodating the other. Consequently, for these reasons, the reasons listed in the above paragraph and other reasons not listed herein, it is respectfully requested that Claim 26 be allowed.

For these reasons, it is believed that none of the prior art teaches the claimed invention. Furthermore, it is believed that the foregoing amendment has adequate support in the specification, and accordingly there should be no new matter. Applicant believes that the pending claims have addressed each of the issues pointed out by the Examiner in the Office Action. In light of the foregoing amendments, the claims should be in a condition for allowance. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the proposed changes, Applicant again invites the Examiner to do so by telephone conference.

App. No. 10/619,817
Attorney Docket 3170.2.1 NP
Respectfully submitted,



Jason P. Webb
Reg. No. 55,714
Attorney for Applicant

Date: October 14, 2004

Jason P. Webb
Starkweather & Associates
9035 South 1300 East
Suite 200
Sandy, Utah 84094
Telephone: 801-272-8368

Amendments to the Drawings

NONE